

## **REMARKS**

Claims 2-20 are pending in the application. Claim 1 was objected to because of informalities. Claims 1-8 and 11 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Hanagata (U.S. Patent No. 5,953,058), Sugiyama (U.S. Patent No. 6,262,779) and Tanji (U.S. Patent No. 5,767,900). Claims 9-10 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Hanagata and in view of Sugiyama, Tanji and Schwartz (U.S. Patent No. 3,980,819). Applicants respectfully traverse the objection and rejections as follows.

### **A. Amendment to Claims**

Claim 1 has been cancelled and claims 12-20 have been newly added. Claims 2-11, which have directly or indirectly depended from claim 1, have been amended to depend from new claim 12. Amendment to cancel the rejected claim may be made after a final rejection. *See* 37 C.F.R. § 1.116(b). New claim 12, which replaces claim 1, has the scope that is the same as or similar to that of claim 1 and has been rewritten to present the claimed invention in better format. New claims 13-20 have been added to present the claimed subject matter of the Application in better form for consideration for allowance or to narrow the issues for appeal. New claims 12-20 clearly distinguish the claimed inventions of the Application from the cited references including the new cited reference, Schwartz. Further, claims 5-11 were added in response to the office action dated November 7, 2003 and Applicants did not have any chance to amend claims 5-11 in response to the Office Action. Based on the above, Applicants respectfully request the Examiner to enter these amendments.

### **B. Objection to claim 1**

Claim 1 was objected to because limitations of “a contour-adjusting circuit” and “a selecting circuit” conflict with each other. The Office Action asserts that the contour-adjusting circuit requires one type of input signal, whereas the selecting circuit requires two types of input signals due to the phrase, “in accordance with the type of input video signals.” Applicants submit that because claim 1 has been cancelled, the objection to claim 1 is moot.

### **C. Rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 103**

Claims 2-20 are patentable because none of the prior references discloses a video signal processing circuit wherein NTSC video signals, PAL video signals and high definition television transmission color signals are configured to be inputted and outputted as suitably contour-adjusted, either individually or in combination.

Claims 1-8 and 11 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Hanagata in view of Sugiyama and Tanji. The Office Action asserts that it would have been obvious to one of skill to combine (i) contour-adjusting of a Y-signal in Hanagata; (ii) a circuit selecting NTSC/PAL video signals or HDTV signals in Sugiyama; and (iii) contour-adjusting of R, G and B signals in Tanji. Claims 9-10 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Hanagata in view of Sugiyama, Tanji and Schwartz. Applicants respectfully disagree.

Claim 1 has been cancelled and claim 12 has been newly added. Claims 2-11 have been amended to depend from claim 12. Claim 12 defines a video signal processing circuit configured to receive as an input one of NTSC video signals, PAL video signals and high definition television transmission color signals and peak the received signals for contour adjustment. The recited video signal processing circuit outputs resulting R, G and B signals. A single contour-adjusting circuit included in the video signal processing circuit can contour-adjust different types of video signals, i.e., NTSC video signals, PAL video signals and high definition television transmission color signals. Accordingly, a simple configuration of the video signal processing circuit with reduction in size and manufacturing cost can be achieved.

None of the cited references teaches or suggests the recited video signal processing circuit in claim 12, either individually or in combination. Even if Hanagata, Sugiyama and Tanji may include teachings asserted by the Office Action and they may be combined, such combination does not teach the recited video signal processing circuit of claim 12. Neither Hanagata nor Tanji discloses a contour-adjusting circuit that processes the NTSC video signals, the PAL video signals and the high definition television signal. The Office Action asserts that Hanagata teaches its own contour-adjusting circuit (constant generating circuit 4) for the Y-signal and Tanji discloses its own contour-adjusting circuit (contour enhancement circuit 16) for the R, G and B signals. However, neither Hanagata nor Tanji teaches or suggests that the constant generating circuit 4 processes the R, G and B signals in the NTSC/PAL system and that the contour enhancement circuit 16 processes the Y signal in the high definition television system. Accordingly, when Hanagata and Tanji are combined, two separate circuits, i.e., the constant generating circuit 4 and the contour enhancement circuit 16, separately and respectively, process the Y signal and the R, G and B signals. This combination presents the same problems of the prior art of claim 12, i.e., separate contour-adjusting circuits should be provided for the

video signals in the NTSC, PAL and high definition television systems because frequency bands of video signals and signal processing methods are different depending on the systems.

Based on the above, none of Hanagata, Sugiyama and Tanji teaches the recited video signal processing circuit of claim 12, either individually or in combination. Because claims 2-11 depend from claim 12, they include all features of claim 12 plus additional features.

Accordingly, none of the cited references, i.e., Hanagata, Sugiyama and Tanji, teaches claims 2-11. Further, as the Office Action concedes, Schwartz does not disclose an appending circuit claimed in claims 9-10. None of the cited references including Schwartz teaches claims 9-10, either individually or in combination.


#### **C. New Claims 13-20**

New claims 13-20 are patentable for reasons that they each cite a video signal processing circuit wherein NTSC video signals, PAL video signals and high definition television transmission color signals are configured to be inputted and outputted as suitably contour-adjusted. None of the cited references, either alone or in combination, discloses the video signal processing circuit defined in claims 13-20. Thus, claims 13-20 are patentable and should be allowed. Please note that new claims 13-20 are not being presented for reasons of patentability as defined in *Festo Corporation v. Shoketsu Kinzoku Kogyo Kabushiki Co., Ltd*, 535 U.S. 722 (2002).

### CONCLUSION

In view of the arguments above, pending claims 2-20 are patentable. Applicants respectfully request the Examiner to enter the amendments to the claims and grant allowance of this application. If for any reason, the Examiner is unable to allow the application in the next Office Action and believes that an interview would be helpful to resolve any remaining issues, he is respectfully requested to contact the undersigned attorneys at (312) 321-4200.

Respectfully submitted,



Gustavo Siller, Jr.  
Registration No. 32,305  
Attorney for Applicants

BRINKS HOFER GILSON & LIONE  
P.O. BOX 10395  
CHICAGO, ILLINOIS 60610  
(312) 321-4200